

layer 12 and the micro lens 11 is promoted by forming the first transparent resin layer 12 after transforming the surface of the micro lens 11 by etching the surface by thickness of about 500Å by means of oxygen plasma, or after effecting a surface activation by spin coating or vapor-phase coating hexamethyl disilazine (HMDS) or the like, or after successively effecting the above-mentioned two processes.

That is, Aoki only etches the surface of the micro lens 11 to promote adhesion with the first transparent resin layer 12. Aoki does not teach or suggest reducing the optical thickness of the micro lens 11, let alone when the optical thickness of the manufactured lens is greater than a target optical thickness. In fact, Aoki does not teach or suggest a target optical thickness at all.

As described in Applicant's specification at, for example, page 4, line 22, the optical thickness has a specific meaning in the field of optics. Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not understand the etching of a surface of a micro lens to promote adhesion with a resin layer to teach or suggest reducing an optical thickness of a lens.

As stated in MPEP §2141.02(I), in determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, it must be determined whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. The Office Action appears to improperly ignore the language of claim 5 to assert that Aoki teaches all of the claimed features. Claim 5 does not merely recite etching a lens so that its thickness is reduced. Aoki clearly does not disclose anything regarding an optical thickness, a target thickness, or a comparison to determine when to perform the etching.

At least for these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is patentable over Aoki.

Claims 6, 8 and 9 are patentable at least for their dependence on claim 5, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 11 under 35. U.S.C. §102(b) over Aoki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,914,724 to Redmond. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Redmond does not overcome the deficiencies of Aoki with respect to claim 5. Therefore, claim 11 is patentable at least for its dependence on claim 5, as well as for the additional features it recites.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino  
Registration No. 33,565

Klifton L. Kime  
Registration No. 42,733

MAC:KXH/tbh

Date: March 14, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--